

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 1-9 are currently being prosecuted. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his rejections in view of the remarks as set forth below.

References Cited Form

Applicants note that the PTO-892, references cited form appears to be missing from the action. The office of the undersigned contacted the Examiner on June 21, 2004, to note the situation. Applicants request that the Examiner provide a new PTO-892 form in the next action.

Drawings

The Examiner objected to the drawings as failing to show claim features. The Examiner states that the transceiver, buttons and display are not shown in the drawings. By way of the present amendment, a substitute Fig. 1 has been added which shows these items. In addition, the specification has been amended on page 3 to include the reference numerals now used in the drawings for these items. Accordingly, this objection is believed to be overcome.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7 and 8 as being obvious over Saulsbury. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner states that Saulsbury shows an internet phone that transmits signals through a USB interface to a thin client including the steps of inputting and outgoing messages through the digital phone, transmitting the outgoing message signal to the thin client through the interface, converting the outgoing message signal into an outgoing message VOIP package, converting the incoming message VOIP package into incoming message signals in the thin client, transmitting the incoming message signals to the digital phones through the interface and outputting the incoming message signals through the digital phone. The Examiner admits that the reference does not teach storing the outgoing message VOIP package on a local area network and transmitting the outgoing message package to a target through the internet and returning an incoming message package from the target to the local area network through the internet. The Examiner points out that Saulsbury does show a wide area network employing frame relay and ATM. The Examiner feels that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to include storing the outgoing message VOIP package on a local area network and transmitting the outgoing message VOIP package to the target through the internet and

returning an incoming message VOIP package from the target to the local area network.

Applicants disagree that the present claims are obvious over this reference. Applicants agree that Saulsbury shows a wide area network employing a frame relay and ATM. However, Applicants submit that the storing of the message package at a local area network and transmitting and returning VOIP messages is not taught. Further, Applicants submit that it would not be obvious to include these functions in Saulsbury. The Examiner has made a bald statement that these steps would be obvious without any indication as to why they would be obvious. There is no motivation for one skilled in the art to perform these steps based on the structure of Saulsbury that has been shown. Applicants submit that without some teaching as to why this would be obvious, the claims are patentable. In view of this, Applicants submit that the rejection of independent claim 1, 4 and 7 is overcome.

Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8 and 9 depend from these independent claims and as such are also considered to be allowable. In addition, each of these claims recites other features such as the windows terminal and network terminal in the thin client and the transceiver, buttons and display of the digital phone. Accordingly, these claims are considered to be additionally allowable.

Claims 3, 6 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over Saulsbury in view of Chiu et al. (US Published Application 2002/0071424). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Even if the Chiu et al. reference does teach the features suggested by the Examiner, Applicants submit that it does not aid the primary reference in overcoming its deficiencies. Accordingly, Applicants submit that these claims are also allowable.

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that the claims clearly distinguish over the patents relied on by the Examiner, either alone or in combination. In view of this, reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of all the claims is respectfully requested.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Robert F. Gnuse (Reg. No. 27,295) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any


overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 
Joe McKinney Muncy, #32,334

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

 KM/RFG:cms
3313-0273P

Attachment(s): Replacement Drawing - Fig. 1

(Rev. 02/12/2004)